

---

## ***In This Section***

- “Big Picture” Overview for the Satilla River Basin
- General Basinwide Management Strategies
- Targeted Management Strategies

### *Section 7*

---

# Implementation Strategies

This section builds on the priority issues identified in Section 6 and proposes strategies to address the major water quality problems in the Satilla River basin.

Georgia’s Mission Statement for river basin management planning is “to develop and implement a river basin planning program to protect, enhance, and restore the waters of the state of Georgia that will provide for effective monitoring, allocation, use, regulation, and management of water resources”. Associated with this mission are a variety of goals which emphasize coordinated planning necessary to meet all applicable local, state, and federal laws, rules, and regulations, and provide for water quality, habitat, and recreation. For the Satilla basin, these goals will be implemented through a combination of a variety of general strategies, which apply across the basin and across the state, and targeted or site-specific strategies. Section 7.1 describes the big-picture management goals for the Satilla River basin. Section 7.2 describes the general and basinwide implementation strategies most relevant to the Satilla River. Targeted strategies for specific priority concerns within each subbasin, as identified in Section 6, are then presented in 7.3.

## **7.1 “Big Picture” Overview for the Satilla River Basin**

This Satilla River Basin Management Plan includes strategies to address a number of different basinwide objectives. These include:

- Protecting water quality in lakes, rivers, streams, estuaries, and coastal waters through attainment of water quality standards and support for designated uses;
- Providing adequate, high quality water supply for municipal, agricultural, industrial, and other human activities;
- Preserving habitat suitable for the support of healthy aquatic and riparian ecosystems;

- Protecting human health and welfare through prevention of water-borne disease; minimization of risk from contaminated fish tissue, and reduction of risks from flooding; and
- Ensuring opportunities for economic growth, development, and recreation in the region.

Achieving these objectives is the responsibility of a variety of state and federal agencies, local governments, business, industry, and individual citizens. Coordination between partners is difficult, and impacts of actions in one locale by one partner on conditions elsewhere in the basin are not always understood or considered. River Basin Management Planning (RBMP) is an attempt to bring together stakeholders in the basin to increase coordination and to provide a mechanism for communication and consideration of actions on a broad scale to support water resource objectives for the entire basin. RBMP provides the framework to begin to understand the consequences of local decisions on basinwide water resources.

RBMP, begun in 1993, is changing the way EPD and other state agencies coordinate business. At the same time, local government comprehensive planning requirements require a higher degree of effort and awareness by local governments to address resource protection and planning for the future.

This plan presents general broad-scale goals and strategies for addressing the most significant existing and future water quality and quantity issues within the Satilla basin. The basin plan provides a whole-basin framework for appropriate local initiatives and controls, but cannot specify all the individual local efforts which will be required. The basin plan will, however, provide a context and general management goals for the local-scale plans needed to address local-scale nonpoint loads in detail. EPD expects local governments and agencies to take the initiative to develop local strategies consistent with the basin-scale strategies presented in this plan.

A number of concerns identified in this plan will affect planning and decision-making by local governments, state agencies, and business interests. Detailed strategies for addressing identified concerns are presented in Section 7.4. This section provides an overview of the key “big picture” issues and planning opportunities in the Satilla River basin.

### **7.1.1 Water Quality Overview**

As discussed in Section 5, water quality in the Satilla River basin is generally good at this time, although problems remain to be addressed and proactive planning is needed to protect water quality into the future. Many actions have already been taken to protect water quality. Programs implemented by federal, state, and local governments, farmers, foresters, and other individuals have greatly helped to protect and improve water quality in the basin over the past twenty years. Streams are no longer dominated by untreated or partially treated sewage or industrial discharges, which resulted in little oxygen and impaired aquatic life. For the most part, local government and industrial wastewaters are properly treated, oxygen levels have returned, and fish have followed.

The primary source of pollution that continues to affect waters of the Satilla River basin results from nonpoint sources. Key types of nonpoint source pollution impairing or potentially threatening water quality in the Satilla River basin include erosion and sedimentation, bacteria and oxygen demanding substances from urban and rural nonpoint sources, and nonpoint of mercury (particularly air deposition) which accumulates in fish tissue. These problems result from the cumulative effect of activities of many individual landowners or managers. Population is growing every year, increasing the potential risks from nonpoint source pollution. Growth is essential to the economic health of the Satilla River basin, yet growth without proper land use planning and implementation of best

management practices to protect streams and rivers can create harmful impacts on the environment.

Because there are so many small sources of nonpoint loading spread throughout the watershed, nonpoint sources of pollution cannot effectively be controlled by state agency permitting and enforcement, even where regulatory authority exists. Rather, control of nonpoint loading will require the cooperative efforts of many partners, including state and federal agencies, individual landowners, agricultural and forestry interests, local county and municipal governments, and Regional Development Centers. A combination of regulatory and voluntary land management practices will be necessary to maintain and improve the water quality of rivers, streams, and lakes in the Satilla River basin.

### **Key Actions by EPD**

The Georgia EPD Water Protection Branch has responsibility for establishing water quality standards, monitoring water quality, river basin planning, water quality modeling, permitting and enforcement of point source NPDES permits, and developing Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) where ongoing actions are not sufficient to achieve water quality standards. Much of this work is regulatory. EPD is also one of several agencies responsible for facilitating, planning, and educating the public about management of nonpoint source pollution. Nonpoint source programs implemented by Georgia and by other states across the nation are voluntary in nature. The Georgia EPD Water Resources Branch regulates the use of Georgia's surface and ground water resources for municipal and agricultural uses, which includes source water assessment and protection activities in compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Actions being taken by EPD at the state level to address water quality problems in the Satilla River basin include the following:

- **Watershed Assessments and Watershed Protection Implementation Plans.** When local governments propose to expand an existing wastewater facility, or propose a new facility with a design flow greater than 0.5 million gallons per day, EPD requires a comprehensive watershed assessment and development of a watershed protection implementation plan. The watershed assessment includes monitoring and assessment of current water quality and land use in the watershed and evaluation of the impacts of future land use changes. A watershed protection implementation plan includes specific strategies such as land use plans and local actions designed to ensure that existing problems are being addressed and that future development will be conducted in a way to prevent water quality standards violations.
- **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** Where water quality sampling has documented standards violations and ongoing actions are not sufficient to achieve water quality standards in a two year period, a TMDL will be established for a specific pollutant on the specific stream segment in accordance with EPA guidance. The TMDL will specify the allowable loading of a pollutant from both point and nonpoint sources. EPD will implement TMDLs through a watershed approach using a combination of regulatory and non-regulatory tools.
- **Source Water Protection.** The public water supply in the Satilla basin is drawn from groundwater. To provide for the protection of public water supplies, Georgia EPD is developing a Source Water Assessment Program in alignment with the 1996 amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act and corresponding recent EPA initiatives. This new initiative is expected to result in assessments of threats to drinking water supplies and, ultimately, local Source Water Protection Plans. Recent "Criteria for Watershed Protection" (a sub-section of the Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria) produced by the Department of Community

Affairs set minimum guidelines for protection of watersheds above “governmentally owned” water supply intakes.

- **Fish Consumption Guidelines.** EPD and the Wildlife Resources Division work to protect public human health by testing fish tissue and issuing fish consumption guidelines as needed, indicating the recommended rates of consumption of fish from specific waters. The guidelines are based on conservative assumptions and provide the public with factual information for use in making rational decisions regarding fish consumption.

### **Key Actions by Resource Management Agencies**

Nonpoint source pollution from agriculture and forestry activities in Georgia is managed and controlled with a statewide non-regulatory approach. This approach is based on cooperative partnerships with various agencies and a variety of programs.

Agriculture in the Satilla River basin is primarily restricted to livestock and poultry operations. Key partners for controlling agricultural nonpoint source pollution are the Soil and Water Conservation Districts, the Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission, and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service. These partners promote the use of environmentally sound best management practices (BMPs) through education, demonstration projects, and financial assistance. In addition to incentive payments and cost-sharing for BMPs, three major conservation programs from USDA will be available to producers and rural landowners. These are the Conservation Reserve Program, which protects highly erodible and environmentally sensitive land; the Wetland Reserve Program, designed to protect, restore, and enhance wetlands with cost-share incentives; and the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program, which will help landowners develop and improve wildlife habitat.

Forestry is a major part of the economy in the Satilla basin. The Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) is the lead agency for controlling silvicultural nonpoint source pollution. The GFC develops forestry practice guidelines, encourages BMP implementation, conducts education, investigates and mediates complaints involving forestry operations, and conducts BMP compliance surveys. Recently, the State Board of Registration for Foresters adopted procedures to sanction or revoke the licenses of foresters involved in unresolved complaints where the lack of BMP implementation has resulted in water quality violations.

### **Key Actions by Local Governments**

Addressing water quality problems resulting from nonpoint source pollution will primarily depend on actions taken at the local level. Particularly for nonpoint sources associated with urban and residential development, it is only at the local level that regulatory authority exists for zoning and land use planning, control of erosion and sedimentation from construction activities, and regulation of septic systems.

Local governments are increasingly focusing on water resource issues. In many cases, the existence of high quality water has not been recognized and managed as an economic resource by local governments. That situation is now changing due to a variety of factors, including increased public awareness, high levels of population growth in many areas resulting in a need for comprehensive planning, recognition that high quality water supplies are limited, and new state-level actions and requirements. The latter include:

- Requirements for Watershed Assessments and Watershed Protection Implementation Plans when permits for expanded or new municipal wastewater discharges are requested;
- Development of Source Water Protection Plans to protect public drinking water supplies;

- Requirements for local comprehensive planning, including protection of natural and water resources, as promulgated by the Georgia Department of Community Affairs.

In sum, it is the responsibility of local governments to implement planning for future development which takes into account management and protection of the water quality of rivers, streams, and lakes within their jurisdiction. One of the most important actions that local governments should take to ensure recognition of local needs while protecting water resources is to participate in the basin planning process, either directly or through Regional Development Centers.

### **7.1.2 Water Quantity Overview**

In addition to protecting water quality, it is essential to plan for water supply in the Satilla River basin. The Georgia EPD Water Resources Branch regulates the use of Georgia's surface and ground water resources for municipal and agricultural uses, and is responsible for ensuring sufficient instream flows are available during a critical drought condition to meet permitted withdrawal requirements without significant impact to the environment. The withdrawal permit process must not overuse the available resources. The Water Resources Branch is also responsible for regulation of public water systems for compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act, and regulation of dams for compliance with the Safe Dams Act.

In 1997, to address concerns regarding overuse of groundwater in coastal Georgia, Georgia EPD developed the "Interim Strategy for Managing Salt Water Intrusion in the Upper Floridan Aquifer of Southeast Georgia" to address concerns regarding the general regional use of groundwater throughout coastal Georgia that is leading to declining water levels in the Floridan aquifer. Among the interim strategy inclusion policies such as establishing caps on ground water use in the capped areas of Glynn County, Chatham County and southern portions of Bryan and Effingham Counties, reduction in ground water use in Chatham County by at least 10 million gallons per day by December 2005.

In response to the severe drought conditions in Georgia during the May 1998-2000 period, EPD developed a Georgia Drought Report that summarizes the drought impacts and provides an objective assessment of the state's vulnerability and mitigation efforts; evaluates the management actions implemented by state and local authorities during the drought of 1998-2000; and presents a set of recommendations for improving drought preparedness and response. Among the recommendations included are for the state to develop an effective method to evaluate consumptive use of water for agricultural irrigation, and implement programs for reducing water use while protecting the prosperity of farmers and agricultural communities.

## **7.2 General Basinwide Management Strategies**

There are many statewide programs and strategies that play an important role in the maintenance and protection of water quality in the Satilla basin. These general strategies are applicable throughout the basin to address both point and nonpoint source controls.

### **7.2.1 General Surface Water Protection Strategies**

#### **Antidegradation**

The State of Georgia considers all waters of the state as high quality and applies a stringent level of protection for each waterbody. Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control, Chapter 391-3-6-03(2)(b) contains specific antidegradation provisions as follows:

(b) Those waters in the State whose existing quality is better than the minimum levels established in standards on the date standards become effective will be maintained at high quality; with the State having the power to authorize new developments, when it has been affirmatively demonstrated to the State that a change is justifiable to provide necessary social or economic development and provided further that the level of treatment required is the highest and best practicable under existing technology to protect existing beneficial water uses. Existing instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing uses shall be maintained and protected. All requirements in the Federal Regulations, 40 C.F.R. 131.12, will be achieved before lowering of water quality is allowed for high quality water.

The antidegradation review process is triggered at such time as a new or expanded point source discharge is proposed that may have some effect on surface water quality. Such proposals are reviewed to determine if the new discharge is justifiable to provide necessary social or economic development and that the level of treatment required is the highest and best practicable under existing technology to protect existing beneficial water uses.

Applicants for new or expanded point source discharges into any surface water must perform an alternative analysis comparing the proposed discharge alternative to a “no-discharge” land application or urban reuse alternative. The application for discharge to surface waters will only be considered if the less degrading alternatives are determined to be economically or technically infeasible. In all cases, existing instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing use shall be maintained and protected.

### **Water Supply Watershed Protection Strategy**

As population continues to increase within the Satilla River basin, it will become ever more important to protect the water quality of already developed raw water sources. EPD is acting in concert with the Department of Community Affairs to produce a set of “guidelines” which define, among other things, measures that local governments are encouraged to take to protect drinking water sources. The “guidelines” are entitled Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria, and establish environmental protection criteria for five environmental categories: water supply watersheds, groundwater recharge areas, mountains, river corridors and wetlands. The *Criteria for Watershed Protection* (a subsection of the Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria) set minimum guidelines for protection of watersheds above “governmentally owned” water supply intakes. The degree of protection depends upon the size of the watershed; watersheds with drainage areas of less than 100 square miles are subject to more strict criteria as summarized below:

- Impervious surface densities limited to 25 percent over the entire watershed.
- Buffer/setback requirements equal to 100/150 feet within seven (7) mile radius of the intake and 50/75 feet outside the seven (7) mile radius; and
- A reservoir management plan (including 150 foot buffer around the perimeter of the reservoir).

Watersheds with drainage areas of 100 square miles or more are subject to less strict criteria as summarized below:

- An intake on a flowing stream (as opposed to being located within a reservoir) shall have no specified minimum criteria; and

- An intake with a water supply reservoir shall have a minimum of 100 feet natural buffer within a seven mile radius of the reservoir, and no impervious cover constructed within a 150 foot setback area on both banks of the stream.

EPD is also actively working toward meeting the national goal that, by the year 2005, 60 percent of the population served by community water systems will receive their water from systems with source water protection programs (SWPP) in place under both wellhead protection and watershed protection programs. EPD intends to accomplish this goal by developing and implementing a source water assessment program (SWAP) in alignment with EPA's initiatives.

EPA approved EPD's Source Water Assessment and Protection Implementation Plan for Public Drinking Water Sources on April 24, 2000. The Plan specifies how source water assessment areas are to be delineated, lists potential contaminants of concern needing to be identified in the delineated areas, provides methodology for determining the susceptibility of a public water supply source and provides the basis for preparing local individual source water protection plans for public water supply systems. EPA has given the Drinking Water Program (DWP) the flexibility to help complete the local source water protection plans for contracted public water systems and provide financial and technical assistance to help develop long range source water protection strategies for the public water system. The Source Water Assessment program builds upon EPD's other assessment and prevention programs, including the Well Head Protection Program, the Vulnerability Assessment and Waiver Program, and the River Basin Management Plans, by soliciting active public participation from the local communities and assisting in the preparation of the local water system's protection plan.

### **Total Maximum Daily Loads**

Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) establishes the TMDL, or total maximum daily load, process as a tool to implement water quality standards. Georgia is required by the CWA to identify and list waterbodies where water quality standards are not met following the application of technology based controls, and to establish TMDLs for the listed stream segments. The USEPA is required to approve or disapprove Georgia's 303(d) list of waters and TMDLs.

The most recent requirement for 303(d) list submittal occurred in 2000. Georgia public noticed and submitted a draft 303(d) list package to the EPA in February 2000. The public and EPA reviewed the draft 303(d) list package and provided comments in March 2000. Georgia reviewed the input, made appropriate changes and submitted a final 303(d) listing to the EPA in April 2000. EPA approved the Georgia list in August 2000.

Georgia's 2000 303(d) listing is based on the Georgia 305(b) water quality assessments. The 305(b) assessment is presented in the report *Water Quality in Georgia, 1998-1999*. The 305(b) assessment tables are reprinted in Appendix E of this report. The tables provide a code indicating the 303(d) listing status of assessed segments within the Satilla River basin. An "X" in the 303(d) column indicates the segment is on the Georgia 303(d) list. A complete explanation of the codes in the 303(d) column is given below.

NA Waters assessed as supporting designated uses. These waters are not part of the Georgia 303(d) list.

- 1 Segments identified as not supporting or partially supporting designated uses where actions have been taken and compliance with water quality standards achieved. These segments are not part of the Georgia 303(d) list.
- 2 Segments identified as not supporting or partially supporting designated uses where existing enforceable State, local, or Federal requirements are expected to

lead to attainment of water quality standards within two years without additional control strategies. These segments are not part of the Georgia 303(d) list.

- 3 Segments where TMDLs were completed and approved by EPA in 1998-2001. These waters are not part of the Georgia 303(d) list.
- X Waters on the Georgia 303(d) list. These segments are assessed as not supporting or partially supporting designated uses, and may require additional controls to achieve designated uses. These segments make up the Georgia 303(d) list.

Georgia and/or EPA developed and publicly noticed TMDLs for all listed waters in the Satilla River basin in 2000. Each of the TMDLs with the exception of one for dissolved oxygen for Seventeen Mile Creek was finalized and approved the EPA in 2001. The TMDL for dissolved oxygen for Seventeen Mile Creek was finalized in 2002. The TMDLs are incorporated herein by reference. The TMDLs are too voluminous to be attached, however, copies of any or all of the TMDLs adopted by reference may be obtained by contracting the Water Protection Branch.

### **7.2.2 Management of Permitted Point Sources**

The strategies in this section strive to minimize adverse effects from municipal, industrial, and concentrated discharges. Permitted discharges of treated wastewater are managed via the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination system (NPDES) permit program. The NPDES permit program provides a basis for regulating municipal and industrial discharges, monitoring compliance with effluent limitations, and initiating appropriate enforcement action for violations. EPD has formulated general strategies for a number of types of environmental stressors under the NPDES program.

#### **Analysis of Alternatives**

Applicants for new or expanded point source discharges into any surface water must perform an alternative analysis comparing the proposed discharge alternative to a “no discharge”, land application or urban reuse alternative. The application for discharge to surface waters will only be considered if the less degrading alternatives are determined to be economically or technically infeasible. In all cases, existing instream water uses and the level of water quality necessary to protect the existing use shall be maintained and protected.

#### **Permit Issuance/Reissuance Strategies**

During the basin plan implementation phase, issues identified in the written basin plan pertaining to point source discharges will be assessed. The assessment will include such things as 1) identified point source discharge problem areas, 2) data evaluations, 3) wasteload allocations and/or TMDLs with identified problem point sources, and 4) toxic pollutants identified with point source discharges. Permits associated with identified problems will be evaluated to determine if a reopening of the permit is appropriate to adequately address the problem.

#### **Watershed Assessment Requirements**

A watershed assessment is generally initiated when, due to growth and development, a local government sees a need to increase the hydraulic capacity of an existing wastewater treatment facility (or propose a new facility) and contacts the EPD for a NPDES permit modification. If an antidegradation review demonstrates that it is not feasible to handle the additional capacity needs with a land treatment or other no discharge system, the community may pursue an increase in its surface water discharge. The initial step in this process is the completion of a watershed assessment, which is the first step towards assuring that all water quality standards will be maintained throughout a watershed during



both critical dry and wet weather conditions in response to both point and nonpoint source loads.

The watershed assessment is actually a study, an assessment, and a plan. It is about collecting data and learning relationships between what is going on in a watershed and how these activities (land uses, etc.) impact water quality, then using this knowledge to develop both short and long term plans designed to ensure the attainment of water quality standards. The assessment should address current conditions and consider projected land use changes. Only when it can be demonstrated that water quality standards are and will continue to be maintained, can the EPD develop a wasteload allocation and prepare a defensible permit for a proposed new wastewater treatment facility or proposed hydraulic expansion of an existing wastewater treatment facility discharging to the watershed. The assessment should include a detailed plan to address both current water quality and biological problems and any predicted future water quality and biological problems. Key components of such a plan may be adopted by EPD as “special conditions” of the pertinent new or modified NPDES permit.

### **Facility Construction/Improvements**

EPD has promoted continuing improvement in the quality of return flows from permitted point sources in the basin. Upgrading wastewater treatment facilities is a significant strategy to meet effluent limits from discharges. In the past ten years, various upgrades and improvements have been made to industrial and municipal treatment systems throughout the Satilla River basin. The funding for these projects has come from state and federal construction grants and loans and the citizens of local municipalities. Appendix C provides detailed information on expenditures by city and county governments on upgrading wastewater treatment facilities in the basin.

### **Domestic Wastewater Systems**

The collecting, treating and disposing of wastewater in Georgia is regulated by a number of environmental laws that are administered by various agencies in local and state government. When a local government or private concern (owner) identifies a need for a wastewater treatment and disposal system it is imperative that thorough and adequate planning take place.

Wastewater systems that discharge treated wastewater to a surface stream must be permitted through the Georgia National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and meet all the requirements of that system. In Georgia, with very few exceptions, surface discharge permits will only be issued to publicly owned systems.

Wastewater systems that do not result in a discharge to surface waters, such as slow rate land treatment systems and urban reuse systems (no discharge), are permitted through the State of Georgia’s land application system (LAS) permitting process. Both publicly and privately owned systems can apply for and receive LAS permits.

### **Chlorine**

If a chlorine limit is not already required in an NPDES permit, all major municipal wastewater facilities (i.e., those with design flows greater than or equal to 1.0 million gallons per day [MGD]) are required to meet a chronic toxicity-based chlorine limitation when the permit comes up for routine reissuance. The limitation is calculated based on a maximum instream concentration of 0.011 mg/l, the facility’s design flow, and the 7Q10 low flow of the receiving stream. No facilities are given a limitation higher than 0.5 mg/l as this is deemed to be an operationally achievable number even if a facility does not have dechlorination equipment installed. Facilities which are given a limitation more stringent than 0.5 mg/l which do not already have dechlorination equipment installed, are given up to a two year schedule in which to meet the limitation. All discharging facilities

which are upgrading are required to meet a chlorine limitation as part of the upgrade, based on the same criteria noted above.

### **Ammonia**

Ammonia in effluents poses a problem both as a source of toxicity to aquatic life and as an oxygen-demanding waste. New facilities and facilities proposed for upgrade are required to meet ammonia limits for toxicity if those limits are more stringent than instream dissolved oxygen based limits. Existing facilities are not required to meet ammonia limits based on calculated toxicity unless instream toxicity has been identified through toxicity testing.

### **Metals/Priority Pollutants/Aquatic Toxicity**

Major municipal and industrial facilities are required to conduct and submit results of periodic priority pollutant scans and aquatic toxicity tests to EPD as part of their permit monitoring requirements or upon submittal of a permit application for permit reissuance. The data are assessed in accordance with the Georgia Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control. The results of the assessments can be used to trigger either additional priority pollutant monitoring, a toxicity reduction evaluation or permit limits for certain parameters.

### **Color**

The State's narrative water quality standard for color requires that all waters shall be free from material related to discharges which produce color which interferes with legitimate water uses. EPD's color strategy will address this standard for industrial and municipal discharges by implementing permit limits and/or color removal requirements. EPD requires new facilities or discharges to prevent any noticeable color effect on the receiving stream. EPD requires existing facilities with color in their effluent to collect upstream and downstream color samples when their NPDES permit is reissued. The facility must conduct an assessment of the sources of color. Also, a color removal evaluation may be required at permit reissuance. EPD will also target facilities for color removal requirements based on significant citizen complaints of discoloration in streams.

### **Phosphorus**

EPD establishes phosphorus control strategies where needed to address water bodies where water quality is limited by excess phosphorus loading. At the present time, there are no data to suggest phosphorus loading problems in the Satilla River basin.

### **Temperature**

Permits issued for facilities which discharge to primary trout streams are required to have no elevation of natural stream temperatures. Permits issued for facilities which discharge to secondary trout streams are required to not elevate the receiving stream more than 2 degrees Fahrenheit. There are no trout stream in the Satilla River basin.

### **Storm Water Permitting**

The 1987 Amendments to the federal Clean Water Act require permits to be issued for certain types of discharges, with primary focus on runoff from industrial operations and large urban areas. The EPA promulgated Storm Water Regulations on November 16, 1990. EPD subsequently received delegation from the EPA in January 1991 to issue General Permits and regulate storm water in Georgia. EPD has developed and implemented a strategy which assures compliance with the federal regulations.

The "Phase I" Federal Regulations set specific application submittal requirements for large (population 250,000 or more) and medium (population 100,000 to 250,000) municipal separate storm sewer systems. Accordingly, Georgia has issued individual

area-wide NPDES municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) permits to 58 cities and counties in municipal areas with populations greater than 100,000 persons. These permits authorize the municipalities to discharge storm water from the MS4s which they own or operate, and incorporate detailed storm water management programs. These programs may include such measures as structural and non-structural controls, best management practices, inspections, enforcement and public education efforts. Storm water management ordinances, erosion and sediment control ordinances, development regulations and other local regulations provide the necessary legal authority to implement the storm water management programs. Illicit discharge detection and long-term wet weather sampling plans are also included in the management programs. The permit requires the submission of Annual Reports to EPD, describing the implementation of the storm water management program. Among other things, the Annual Report includes a detailed description of the municipality's implementation of its Storm Water Management Plan.

EPA's Phase I Rule addresses only municipalities with populations greater than 100,000 people and construction sites larger than five acres. EPA is proposing a Phase II Rule for municipalities with populations less than 100,000 people and construction sites smaller than five acres. This rule is not expected to be finalized until at least March, 1999. The Phase II Rule will eventually impact some of the municipalities within the basin.

EPD has issued one general permit regulating storm water discharges for 10 of 11 federally regulated industrial subcategories defined in the Phase I Federal regulations. The eleventh subcategory, construction activities, will be covered under a separate general permit, which is not yet finalized. The general permit for industrial activities requires the submission of a Notice of Intent (NOI) for coverage under the general permit, the preparation and implementation of a storm water pollution prevention plan, and in some cases, the monitoring of storm water discharges from the facility. As with the municipal storm water permits, implementation of site-specific best management practices is the preferred method for controlling storm water runoff.

### **7.2.3 Nonpoint Source Management**

The strategies in this section address sources of environmental stressors which are not subject to NPDES permitting and typically originate from diffuse or nonpoint sources associated with land uses. Most strategies that address nonpoint source concerns are not regulatory in nature, but involve a variety of approaches such as technical assistance and education to prevent and reduce nonpoint source pollution in the basin. Strong stakeholder involvement will be essential to effectively implement many of these strategies.

#### **Georgia Nonpoint Source Management Program**

Georgia's initial *Nonpoint Source Assessment Report* and *Nonpoint Source Management Program* were completed in compliance with the Clean Water Act of 1987 and approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in January 1990. The biennial reports, *Water Quality in Georgia*, as required by Section 305(b) of Public Law 92-500, serve as the current process for updating the *Nonpoint Source Assessment Report*.

The State's *Nonpoint Source Management Program* combines regulatory and non-regulatory approaches, in cooperation with other State and Federal agencies, local and regional governments, State colleges and universities, businesses and industries, nonprofit organizations and individual citizens. The State's *Nonpoint Source Management Program* was updated and approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in September 2000. This revision was intended to satisfy the requirements for funding under

Section 319(b) of the Clean Water Act of 1987 and to delineate short- and long-term goals and implementation strategies. Just as important, it was designed to be an information resource for the wide range of stakeholders across the State who are involved in the prevention, control and abatement of nonpoint sources of pollution. It has been developed as an inventory of the full breadth of nonpoint source management (regulatory and non-regulatory) in Georgia, including activities which are currently underway or planned for in the time period FFY 2000 through FFY 2004.

The State's *Nonpoint Source Management Program* focuses on the comprehensive categories of nonpoint sources of pollution identified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency: Agriculture, Silviculture, Construction, Urban Runoff, Resource Extraction, Land Disposal, Hydrologic/Habitat Modification and Other Nonpoint Sources. The Georgia Environmental Protection Division solicited participation from State and Federal agencies, local and regional governments, State colleges and universities, businesses and industries, and nonprofit organizations with significant programs directed towards nonpoint source management. The State's *Nonpoint Source Management Program* comprehensively describes a framework for stakeholder coordination and cooperation and serves to implement a strategy for employing effective management measures and programs to control nonpoint source pollution statewide.

### **Agricultural Nonpoint Source Control Strategies**

Agricultural nonpoint source pollution continues to be managed and controlled with a statewide non-regulatory approach. This approach uses cooperative partnerships with various agencies and a variety of programs. A brief description of these agencies and outline of their functions and programs is provided below.

#### *Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs)*

Georgia's SWCDs were formed by Act No. 339 of the Georgia General Assembly on March 26, 1937. Their role is to provide leadership in the protection, conservation, and improvement of Georgia's soil, water, and related resources. This is accomplished through promotion efforts related to the voluntary adoption of agricultural best management practices (BMPs).

#### *Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission (GSWCC)*

Georgia's SWCDs receive no annual appropriations and are not regulatory or enforcement agencies. Therefore, the GSWCC was also formed in 1937 to support the SWCDs. GSWCC has been designated as the administering or lead agency for agricultural nonpoint source (NPS) pollution prevention in the state. The GSWCC develops NPS water quality programs and conducts educational activities to promote conservation and protection of land and water resources devoted to agricultural uses. Primary functions of the GSWCC are to provide guidance and assistance to the Soil and Water Conservation Districts and provide education and oversight for the Georgia Erosion and Sedimentation Act.

There are a number of other agricultural agencies administering programs to address water quality and natural resource management issues. Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Councils are organized groups of local citizens supported by USDA involved in a program to encourage economic development, as well as the wise conservation of natural and human resources. The University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES) conducts an education and outreach campaign that encourages producers to increase productivity using environmentally sound techniques. This is accomplished through a number of programs like Farm\*A\*Syst, Well Water Testing, Nutrient Management, Soil and Water Laboratory Analysis, and informational material on a wide range of subjects. Georgia's Department of Agriculture (GDA) administers a wide variety of insect and plant disease control programs to help

regulate the use of pesticides. GDA also inspects irrigation system requirements, such as check valves and back flow prevention devices, for protection of groundwater. The Agricultural Research Service (ARS) conducts research designed to improve the effectiveness of agricultural conservation techniques and promote sustainability. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), along with the Farm Services Agency (FSA) and through local Soil and Water Conservation Districts, administers Farm Bill Programs that provide technical and financial incentives to producers to implement agricultural BMPs. The Agricultural Water Use Coordinating Committee, through individual members regularly applies for, and receives, funds under section 319(h) of the Clean Water Act to best management practices and demonstration projects throughout the state. The Georgia Soil and Water Conservation Commission has provided state leadership with many of these efforts.

Collectively, these programs will serve to address resource concerns related to agricultural land uses in a coordinated fashion over the next five years until the second iteration of the River Basin Management Planning Cycle. Much of the information regarding opportunities to participate under this voluntary approach to complying with water quality standards is disseminated through commodity commissions and organizations such as the Farm Bureau Federation, Agribusiness Council, Cattlemen's Association, Milk Producers Association, Pork Producers Association, Poultry Federation, and other agricultural support industries.

#### *Prioritization Activities under the Farm Bill*

The 1996 Farm Bill provides a number of programs, and processes, designed to address those environmental stressors related to nonpoint sources from Agriculture which were identified in section 4.1.2. A new flagship conservation program, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), will provide the lion's share of funding for technical, educational, and financial assistance. The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for EQIP and works with the USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) to set policies, priorities, and guidelines. These two agencies take recommendations from local work groups and a State Technical Committee, comprised of resource professionals from a variety of disciplines, when addressing actual, and potential, resource impairments associated with agricultural land uses.

EQIP provides incentive payments and cost-sharing for conservation practices through 5 to 10 year contracts. Producers may receive federal cost-sharing up to 75 percent of the average cost of certain conservation practices such as terraces, grassed waterways, filter strips, buffer strips, manure management facilities, animal waste utilization, and 46 other conservation practices important to improving and maintaining the health of natural resources in an area. An individual producer can receive as much as \$50,000 in EQIP funds to implement needed conservation practices.

A majority of funds allocated to Georgia (65 percent) will be spent in priority areas where there are serious and critical environmental needs and concerns. High priority is given to areas where state and local governments offer financial and technical assistance, and where agricultural improvements will help meet water quality and other environmental objectives.

The remaining 35 percent of funds allocated to Georgia can be extended outside priority areas to other parts of the state. Eligibility is limited to persons who are engaged in agricultural productions. Eligible land includes cropland, pastureland, forestland, and other farm lands.

In addition to EQIP there are three major conservation programs from USDA that will be available to producers, and rural landowners. The first is the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which protects highly erodible and environmentally sensitive land with

grass, trees, and other long-term cover. The Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) is a voluntary program designed to protect, restore, and enhance wetlands with cost-share incentives. Also, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) will help landowners develop and improve habitats for upland wildlife, wetland wildlife, endangered species, fisheries, and other wildlife.

### **Forestry Nonpoint Source Control Strategies**

In 1977, the Governor's Silviculture Task Force prepared a report which recommended a voluntary approach to the implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and the designation of the Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) as the lead agency for implementing the Silviculture portion of the State Section 208 Water Quality Management Plan. The GFC was designated as the lead agency for silvicultural nonpoint source pollution prevention in the state in November, 1979. The Forestry Nonpoint Source Control Program is managed and implemented by the GFC, with the support of the forest industry, for the voluntary implementation of best management practices.

The Forestry Nonpoint Source Control Program is managed by a Statewide Coordinator and appointed foresters serving as District Coordinators from each of the 12 GFC districts. The Statewide and District Coordinators conduct educational workshops, training programs and field demonstrations for the forest community (i.e., landowners, land management and procurement foresters, consulting foresters, timber buyers, loggers, site preparation contractors). The GFC investigates and mediates complaints involving forestry operations. In addition, the GFC conducts BMP compliance surveys to assess the effectiveness of BMP in the forest community. The GFC has established procedures for installing water control structures in firebreaks to reduce soil erosion and sedimentation.

Recently, the State Board of Registration for Foresters adopted procedures to sanction or revoke the licenses of professional foresters involved in unresolved complaints where the lack of BMP implementation has resulted in state water quality or federal wetlands requirement violations.

Additional requirements are imposed within the National Forest areas of Georgia. Each National Forest produces and regularly updates and Land and Resource Management Plan to guide timber harvest and other activities. These plans establish long range goals and objectives; specific management prescriptions and the vicinity in which they will occur; standards and guidelines on how management prescriptions will be applied; and monitoring procedures to assure the Plan is followed.

### **Urban Nonpoint Source Control Strategies**

The 1990 report of the Community Stream Management Task Force, *We All Live Downstream*, established a road map for urban nonpoint source management in Georgia. The Task Force recognized two major impediments to effectively managing the quality of urban water bodies. The first is the division between 1) statutory responsibilities for management of water quality, granted to EPD, and 2) local government's Constitutional responsibility for management of the land activities which affect urban water bodies. The second impediment is the widespread nature of the nonpoint sources and the variety of activities which may contribute to impacts from urban runoff. They concluded that management of urban nonpoint source pollution would require "... a cooperative partnership between layers of government, the private sector, and the general public. The development of such a partnership will require a strong impetus to accept new institutional roles and make the structural changes necessary to support and sustain the stream management process."

EPD has a primary role in facilitating the management of urban runoff, and is responsible for administering and enforcing a variety of permit programs, including

permitting of discharges. In addition to these regulatory activities, EPD seeks to assist in development of local solutions to water quality problems; provides technical information on the water resources of the state; and administers grant programs, with funds from various sources to support non-point source planning and assessment, implementation of BMPs, and regional or local watershed management initiatives. EPD also conducts a variety of outreach and educational activities addressing urban runoff in general, regulatory requirements, and cooperative or non-regulatory approaches.

For urban runoff, activities of the Nonpoint Source Management Program interact strongly with point source controls for combined sewers and storm sewers, both of which discharge urban runoff through point conveyances. While the state continues to have an important regulatory role, aspects of the cooperative intergovernmental partnerships envisioned by the Task Force have emerged and are being strengthened. EPD is implementing programs which go beyond traditional regulation, providing the regulated community with greater flexibility and responsibility for determining management practices. Current activities for urban surface runoff control include the following:

- Implement local nonpoint source (NPS) management programs, streambank and stream restoration activities, and community Adopt-A-Stream programs.
- Develop and disseminate local watershed planning and management procedures.
- Implement state and local Erosion and Sedimentation Control Programs.
- Prepare and disseminate technical information on best management practices and nonpoint source monitoring and assessment.
- Implement NPS education programs for grades K through 12 through Project WET (Water Education for Teachers), as described in Section 7.3.6.
- Implement the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program, as described below in Section 7.3.6.
- Identify and evaluate resources to support urban watershed planning and management.

## **7.2.4 Floodplain Management**

### **Floodplain Management Strategies**

Floodplain Management in the State of Georgia is administered under federal regulations and local ordinances. The federal statutes are found in Title 44 of the Code of Federal Regulations Parts 59-79. As a condition of participation in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP), local political jurisdictions voluntarily adopt Flood Damage Prevention Ordinances, which are based on federal regulations, to enforce and administer floodplain development. Georgia's Floodplain Management Office does not issue permits for floodplain development.

Georgia's Floodplain Management Office, located within the Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Protection Division, serves as liaison between the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and local communities participating in the NFIP. However, Georgia's Floodplain Management Office has no regulatory authority. Participation by the local communities in the NFIP is a requirement for the Federal Government to make flood insurance available to all property owners. Through workshops, newsletters, technical assistance and community visits, the Floodplain Management Office assists local governments to maintain compliance with NFIP requirements. The Floodplain Management Office also provides technical data, floodplain maps, and training workshops to various public and private entities involved in floodplain management and floodplain determinations. In addition, the Floodplain Management Office reviews all state-funded and federal-funded projects for development

in designated Special Flood Hazard Areas. A major thrust of the Floodplain Management Office is to increase the number of political jurisdictions participating in the NFIP, thereby increasing the number of flood insured structures in Georgia.

### **River Care 2000 Program**

Georgia also has strategies to protect and manage riparian floodplain areas. Of particular relevance is River Care 2000, a conservation program which Governor Miller established in September 1995. One key objective of this program is acquisition of river-corridor lands for purposes of protection and to forestall unwise development in flood-prone areas. The Coordinating Committee has approved procedures for three types of projects: Riverway Demonstration Projects, which improve public access to a river with scenic and recreation uses, and protects natural and historic resources by acquiring and managing land in the river corridor; Significant Sites, which are tracts of land which DNR will acquire and operate as a traditional state public-use facility: wildlife management or public fishing area, park or historic site, natural area, or greenway; and Restoration Sites, which are tracts of land which the state will identify, acquire, and manage to reduce nonpoint-source water pollution.

The River Care 2000 program is also charged with assessing important river resources throughout the state and identifying more effective management tools for river corridors. The program recently released a state-wide assessment of resources associated with rivers throughout the state (GA DNR, 1998).

### **7.2.5 Wetland Management Strategies**

The loss of wetlands, because of the associated adverse impacts to flood control, water quality, aquatic wildlife habitat, rare and endangered species habitat, aesthetics, and recreational benefits, has become an issue of increasing concern to the general public as they become better informed of the values and functions of wetlands. There is a lack of accurate assessments for current and historic wetland acreage, but, regardless of the method used to measure total acreage or wetland losses, Georgia still retains the highest percentage of precolonial wetland acreage of any southeastern state.

#### **Efforts to Track No Net Loss of Wetlands**

While the 1993 Federal Administration Wetlands Plan calls for a concerted effort by EPA and other federal agencies to work cooperatively toward achieving a no overall net loss of wetlands in the short term and a net increase in the quantity of the nation's wetlands in the long run, there have been no statutory or executive level directives to carry out this policy. Achievement of the goal of no net loss is dependent upon limited changes to regulations, memoranda of understanding, cooperative agreements, and other partnerships between federal, state, and local governments, conservation organizations, and private citizens.

All dredge and fill activities in freshwater wetlands are regulated in Georgia by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The majority of wetland alterations occur under nationwide or general permits, which include permits for bridge building, minor road crossing fills, and fills of less than ten acres above the "headwaters" point of non-tidal streams where the annual average flow is less than 5 cubic feet per second. Enforcement is carried out by the COE and EPA in freshwater wetlands. Normal agricultural and silvicultural operations are exempted under Section 404 regulations.

The COE may require wetland mitigation activities in association were permitting, including creation, restoration, and protection of wetlands. COE may also require wetland restoration in case of violations.



## Land Acquisition

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Wildlife Resources Division (WRD), began a land acquisition program in 1987 to acquire 60,000 acres of additional lands for Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) and Public Fishing Areas (PFAs). This initiative was funded by \$30 million of 20-year obligation bonds to be paid off by hunting and fishing license increases and WMA permit fees.

Beginning in 1990 Governor Zell Miller initiated Preservation 2000, a \$60 million program to acquire 100,000 acres of lands to be used for wildlife and fisheries management, parks and recreation, natural area preservation, and general conservation. Additional wetlands acquisition occurs as part of the River Care 2000 initiative, discussed above.

### 7.2.6 Stakeholder Involvement/Stewardship Strategies

Effective nonpoint source management must address the numerous activities of individuals, businesses, industries, and governments which can adversely affect urban and rural waters. In many cases, these groups are unaware of the potential impacts of their activities or corrective actions which may be taken. Stakeholder involvement and stewardship are essential to address these major challenges.

Georgia has chosen a two-pronged approach to encourage stewardship via education and citizen monitoring. EPD is the lead agency in these education and citizen monitoring programs, but, like other aspects of the state's nonpoint source management effort, cooperative efforts with local governments and community-based groups are critical to their implementation. Outreach and education, including citizen monitoring, lays the groundwork for behavior change and is often an important pre-requisite for effective implementation of BMPs and comprehensive watershed management programs.

General goals for stakeholder involvement and stewardship strategies are:

- Generate local support for nonpoint source management through public involvement and monitoring of streams and other water bodies and of results of management actions.
- Increase individual's awareness of how they contribute to nonpoint source pollution problems and implement appropriate strategies to motivate behavior change and actions to address those problems.
- Provide the educational tools, assistance, and support for addressing NPS problems to target audiences across the state.

### Georgia Adopt-A-Stream

The *Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program* is a citizen monitoring and stream protection program with two staff positions in the Georgia EPD and five Regional Training Centers. The Regional Training Centers are a network of college-based training centers located in Americus, Columbus, Milledgeville, Savannah, and Valdosta, Georgia. This network of training centers allows the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program to be accessible to all areas of the State. The Regional Training Centers ensure that volunteers are trained consistently and that the monitoring data is professionally assessed for quality assurance and quality control.

Stakeholder involvement and stewardship are essential to implementing Georgia's River Basin Management Planning (RBMP) approach to water resource management. The Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program objectives support the RBMP strategies for stakeholder involvement and stewardship: (1) increase individual's awareness of how they contribute to nonpoint source pollution problems, (2) generate local support for nonpoint source management through public involvement and monitoring of waterbodies,

and (3) provide educational resources and technical assistance for addressing nonpoint source pollution problems statewide.

Currently, more than 10,000 volunteers participate in 200 individual and 45 community sponsored Adopt-A-Stream Programs. Volunteers conduct cleanups, stabilize streambanks, monitor waterbodies using biological and chemical methods, and evaluate habitats and watersheds at over 235 sites throughout the State. These activities lead to a greater awareness of water quality and nonpoint source pollution, active cooperation between the public and local governments in protecting water resources, and the collection of basic water quality data. The Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program focuses on what individuals and communities can do to protect from nonpoint sources of pollution.

Volunteers are offered different levels of involvement. Each level involves an education and action component on a local waterbody. The introductory level consists of setting up a project (i.e., identifying a stream segment, lake, estuary, or wetland, identifying partners, registering with the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program), evaluating land use and stream conditions during a watershed walk, conducting quarterly visual operations and cleanups, and public outreach activities. Volunteers create a “Who to Call for Questions or Problems” list so that if something unusual is noted, immediate professional attention can be obtained. Advanced levels of involvement include biological monitoring, chemical monitoring, habitat improvement or riparian restoration projects.

In addition, the *Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program* and *Keep Georgia Beautiful Program* coordinate *Rivers Alive*, Georgia’s annual volunteer river cleanup event held throughout the month of October that targets the cleanup of streams, rivers, lakes, and wetlands statewide. The mission of *Rivers Alive* is to create awareness of and involvement in the preservation of Georgia’s water resources.

*Rivers Alive 2000* included 85 local cleanup events and attracted more than 14,000 volunteers statewide. During October 2000, volunteers worked over 68,000 hours to remove more than 182,000 pounds of trash and garbage from 332 miles of the State’s waterways. Previous river cleanup events in Georgia have been successful but pale in comparison to the success that has been achieved by *Rivers Alive 2000*. Volunteers have conducted cleanup events and continue to monitor sites along Jekyll Creek in Glynn County.

The goals for *Rivers Alive 2001* are to have at least 16,000 volunteers with at least 100 local events statewide. These goals represent increased efforts that will result in cleaner waters in the State. Organizers and volunteers receive free t-shirts, watershed posters and signs, press releases and public service announcements. Additional information about *Rivers Alive 2001* is available on the website, [www.riversalive.org](http://www.riversalive.org).

The Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program provides volunteers with additional resources such as the *Getting to Know Your Watershed and Visual Stream Survey*, *Biological and Chemical Stream Monitoring*, *Adopt-A-Wetland*, *Adopt-A-Lake*, and *Adopt-A-Stream Teacher’s Guide* manuals, PowerPoint presentations, and promotional and instructional training videos. In addition, a bi-monthly newsletter is published and distributed to over 3000 volunteers statewide with program updates, workshop schedules, and information about available resources. Additional information about the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program is available on the *Rivers Alive* website, [www.riversalive.org/aas.htm](http://www.riversalive.org/aas.htm).

In addition, the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program activities have been correlated to the Georgia Quality Core Curriculum (QCC) Science Standards for grades K-12 and certified teachers in Georgia participating in Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program training workshops will receive Staff Development Unit (SDU) credits. Additional information about the QCC correlations and SDU credits and the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream

QuickTime Training Videos are available on the National Science Center's website, [tech.ncdiscovery.org/ee/aas.htm](http://tech.ncdiscovery.org/ee/aas.htm).

In March 2001, the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream Program partnered with the Environmental Education Alliance of Georgia to conduct an annual conference and awards ceremony. The 2001 conference, *Georgia Environment – Reaching and Teaching Communities*, was held in Columbus, Georgia with over 200 participants.

### **Georgia Project WET (Water Education for Teachers) Program**

A report outlining a plan for nonpoint source education in Georgia was completed in 1994. The Georgia Urban Waterbody Education Plan and Program delineated nonpoint source education strategies for seven target audiences: general public, environmental interest organizations, civic associations, educators, business associations, local government officials and State government officials. Given the limited resources and the scope of efforts required to target each of these audiences concurrently, statewide nonpoint source education and outreach programs have been limited to the Georgia Adopt-A-Stream and Project WET Programs.

In October 1996, the Georgia EPD selected Project WET (Water Education for Teachers) curriculum as the most appropriate water science and nonpoint source education curriculum for the State. The Project WET curriculum is an interdisciplinary water science and education curriculum that can be easily integrated into the existing curriculum of a school, museum, university pre-service class, or a community organization. The goals of the Georgia Project WET Program are to facilitate and to promote awareness, appreciation, knowledge and stewardship of water resources through the development and dissemination of classroom (K-12) ready teaching aids.

The success of the Georgia Project WET Program has been phenomenal. Since 1997, several Project WET facilitator training workshops have been successfully completed in Athens, Atlanta, Dahlonega, Macon, Savannah and Warner Robbins with over 200 Project WET facilitators trained statewide. In addition, 220 Project WET educator workshops have been completed in Georgia with more than 4000 formal and non-formal educators implementing the Project WET curriculum in Georgia with a substantial number of students—over 600,000 students annually!

The University of Georgia, Oglethorpe University, Georgia College and State University, North Georgia College and State University, Georgia Southern University and Kennesaw State University have successfully conducted numerous Project WET educator workshops for university pre-service classes with more than 700 education students certified as Project WET educators. In addition, the Oatland Island Environmental Education Center offers Project WET educator workshops for formal and non-formal educators in the Satilla and St. Marys River Basins. Currently, there are 15 Project WET facilitators with over 250 educators having received certified Project WET training in the Satilla and St. Marys River Basins.

The Georgia Project WET Program provides educators with additional resources such as the Enviroscope Nonpoint Source, Wetlands, and Groundwater Flow Models—demonstration tools used to emphasize the impacts of nonpoint source pollution to surface and ground waters, scripted theatrical performances and costumes for *Mama Bass and the Mudsliders*, and promotional and instructional training videos. In addition, the *Dragonfly Gazette*, a quarterly newsletter, and the *Georgia River of Words Art and Poetry Journal* are published and distributed to over 3000 educators statewide and nationally.

The Georgia Project WET Program has been nationally recognized as a model program for its training strengths and techniques—specifically, the use of arts in

environmental education. The Georgia Project WET Program offers educators in Georgia the opportunity to participate in the *River of Words*, an international poetry and art contest for students (K-12). This contest provides students with the opportunity to explore their own watersheds and to learn their “ecological” addresses through poetry and art. National winners are selected by the former U.S. Poet Laureate, Robert Hass, and the International Children’s Art Museum. Annually, only eight students are selected as National Grand Prize Winners to be honored at the Library of Congress in Washington, DC.

Over 20,000 entries were submitted to the *River of Words 2001* contest—three out of the eight National Grand Prize Winners selected in April 2001 were from Georgia! Since 1997, eight students from Georgia have been recognized as National Grand Prize Winners and an additional 60 students have been selected as National Finalists and Merit Winners.

The students’ original art and poetry have been returned from the international competition and is currently on display in the *Georgia River of Words Exhibition*. The Georgia Project WET Program offers a guidebook for teachers with specific information about Georgia’s watersheds. In addition, several nature centers throughout Georgia offer *River of Words* field trips for students and teachers.

### **7.2.7 Ground Water Protection Strategies**

In 1984, EPD developed its first management plan to guide the management and protection of Georgia’s ground water quantity and quality. The current version, Georgia Geologic Survey Circular 11, published in 1996, is the basis of Georgia’s application to be certified by U.S. EPA for a Comprehensive State Ground Water Protection Plan (CSGWPP). The goal of Georgia’s ground water management plan is:

. . . to protect human health and environmental health by preventing and mitigating significant ground water pollution. To do this, Georgia will assess, protect, and, where practical, enhance the quality of ground waters to levels necessary for current and projected future uses for public health and significant ecological systems.

The goal recognizes that not all ground water is of the same value. The Division’s goal is primarily preventive, rather than curative; but it recognizes that nearly all ground water in the state is usable for drinking water purposes and should remain so. EPD pursues this goal through a policy of anti-degradation by which ground water resources are prevented from deteriorating significantly, preserving them for present and future generations. Selection of this goal means that aquifers are protected to varying degrees according to their value and vulnerability, as well as their existing quality, current use, and potential for future use.

EPD has adequate legal authority to prevent ground water from being significantly polluted and to clean-up ground water in the unlikely event pollution were to occur. Extensive monitoring has shown that incidents of ground water pollution or contamination are uncommon in Georgia; no part of the population is known to be at risk.

In general, the prevention of ground water pollution includes—(1) the proper siting, construction, and operation of environmental facilities and activities through a permitting system; (2) implementation of environmental planning criteria by incorporation in land-use planning by local government; (3) implementation of a Wellhead Protection Program for municipal drinking water wells; (4) detection and mitigation of existing problems; (5) development of other protective standards, as appropriate, where permits are not required; and (6) education of the public to the consequences of ground water contamination and the need for ground water protection.

Ground water pollution is prevented in Georgia through various regulatory programs (administered by the State's Department of Natural Resources) which regulate the proper siting, construction, and operation of the following:

- Public water supply wells, large irrigation wells and industrial wells withdrawing more than 100,000 gallons per day.
- Injection wells of all types.
- Oil and gas wells (including oil and gas production).
- Solid waste handling facilities.
- Hazardous waste treatment/storage/disposal facilities.
- Municipal and industrial land treatment facilities for waste and wastewater sludge.
- Municipal and industrial discharges to rivers and streams.
- Storage/concentration/burial of radioactive wastes.
- Underground storage tanks.

EPD prevents the contamination of ground water used for municipal drinking water through an EPA-approved Wellhead Protection Program. As a result of this program, certain new potentially polluting facilities or operations are restricted from wellhead protection areas, or are subject to higher standards of operation and/or construction. EPD also encourages local governments to adhere to the *Criteria for the Protection of Groundwater Recharge Areas* (a section of the Rules for Environmental Planning Criteria), which define higher standards for facility siting, operation, and clean-up in significant ground water recharge areas. The most stringent guidelines of these criteria pertain to those recharge areas with above average ground water pollution susceptibility indexes.

Additionally, EPD has legal authority under the Georgia Water Quality Control Act to clean up ground water pollution incidents. Additional clean up authority occurs as special trust funds established to clean up leaking underground storage tanks, abandoned hazardous waste sites, and scrap tire dumps.

Most laws providing for protection and management of ground water are administered by EPD. Laws regulating pesticides are administered by the Department of Agriculture, environmental planning by the Department of Community Affairs; and on-site sewage disposal, by the Department of Human Resources. EPD has established formal Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with these agencies. The Georgia Groundwater Protection Coordinating Committee was established in 1992 to coordinate groundwater management activities between the various departments of state government and the several branches of EPD.

### 7.3 Targeted Management Strategies

This section describes specific management strategies that are targeted to address concerns and priority issues for the Satilla River basin which were described in Section 6. Strategies are presented for each issue of concern, with divisions by geographic area and/or HUC Unit as appropriate. For each of the identified concerns, the management strategy consists of five components: a problem statement (identical to that given in Section 6), general goals, ongoing efforts, identified gaps and needs, and strategies for action. The purpose of these statements is to provide a starting point for key participants in the subbasin to work together and implement strategies to address each priority concern. In some cases, a strategy may simply consist of increased monitoring; in other situations, the stakeholders in the subbasin will need to develop innovative solutions to

these water quality issues. While EPD will continue to provide technical oversight, conduct monitoring surveys as needed, and evaluate data on a basin-wide scale, locally-led efforts in the subbasins will be required to help to monitor, assess, restore, and maintain water quality throughout the Satilla River basin.

### **7.3.1 Low Dissolved Oxygen**

#### **Problem Statement**

Water use classification for fishing was not fully supported in several water body segments due to excursions of the water quality standards for dissolved oxygen. These excursions are primarily attributed to nonpoint sources and to natural conditions.

##### *Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070201)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in thirteen tributary segments and three Satilla River mainstem segments due to dissolved oxygen concentrations less than standards. Dissolved oxygen may be lower in these areas due to natural conditions.

##### *Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070202)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in seven tributaries due to dissolved oxygen concentrations less than standards. Low dissolved oxygen in the tributaries was attributed to nonpoint sources. Dissolved oxygen may be lower in these areas due to natural conditions.

##### *Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070203)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two estuarine areas due to dissolved oxygen concentrations less than standards. Low dissolved oxygen was attributed to point and nonpoint sources. Dissolved oxygen may be lower in these estuarine areas due to natural conditions.

#### **General Goals**

Meet water quality standards to support designated water uses.

#### **Ongoing Efforts**

TMDLs have been completed for each stream segment. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.

The Satilla River is a Priority Area for USDA Cost-Share funds to implement agricultural BMPs through NRCS's EQIP Program. Local Soil and Water Conservation Districts and RC&D Councils are working with producers to utilize animal waste according to Nutrient Management Plans through their Lagoon Pumpout Program.

#### **Identified Gaps and Needs**

Low dissolved oxygen concentrations in this part of the state are often due to natural environmental conditions. Work is needed to identify and characterize natural background dissolved oxygen concentrations in this area.

#### **General Strategies for Action**

Low dissolved oxygen concentrations in the various streams in the Satilla River basin were due to nonpoint sources and/or natural environmental conditions. EPD will address nonpoint sources through a watershed protection strategy for the basin.

**Specific Management Objectives**

Maintain dissolved oxygen concentrations adequate to support aquatic life and meet water quality standards.

**Action Plan**

- EPD: monitor and assess use support in the listed waters and develop a watershed strategy for addressing nonpoint sources; develop TMDL implementation plans.
- Local governments will implement storm water management strategies and manage operations of water pollution control plants, participate in development and implementation of TMDL implementation plans.
- NRCS and GFC will continue BMP implementation.
- Local S&WC Districts and RC&D Councils will continue Lagoon Pumpout Program.

**Methods for Tracking Performance**

A reevaluation of the status of the listed waterbodies will be made coincident with the next iteration of the RBMP management cycle for the Satilla River basin in 2002-2006.

**7.3.2 Metals**

*Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070202)*

**Problem Statement**

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two estuarine areas (Gibson and Purvis Creeks) due to an industrial hazardous waste site.

**General Goals**

Meet water quality standards to support designated stream classification of fishing.

**Ongoing Efforts**

The EPA and EPD will continue to implement the ongoing hazardous waste cleanup efforts. TMDLs have been completed for each stream segment. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.

**General Strategies for Action**

The EPA and EPD will continue to implement the ongoing hazardous waste cleanup efforts.

**Specific Management Objectives**

Monitor ambient metals concentrations in the Gibson and Purvis Creeks to assess current water quality status.

**Action Plan**

Additional sampling of Gibson and Purvis Creeks will be conducted as a part of the EPA Hazardous Waste Cleanup project. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.

**7.3.3 Fecal Coliform Bacteria****Problem Statement**

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in six tributary stream segments due to exceedences of the water quality standards for fecal coliform bacteria.

These water quality exceedences are found in a number of stream segments in the Satilla River basin and are primarily attributed to urban runoff, septic systems, sanitary sewer overflows, rural nonpoint sources, and/or animal wastes. A common strategy is proposed for addressing fecal coliform bacteria throughout the basin. However, achieving standards in individual stream segments will depend on the development of site specific local management plans.

*Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070201)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in eleven Satilla River tributary stream segments due to exceedences of the water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. These may be attributed to a combination of urban runoff, septic systems, sanitary sewer overflows, rural nonpoint sources and/or animal wastes.

*Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070202)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in six tributary stream segments due to exceedences of the water quality standard for fecal coliform bacteria. These may be attributed to a combination of urban runoff, septic systems, sanitary sewer overflows, rural nonpoint sources and/or animal wastes.

### **General Goals**

Meet water quality standards to support designated water uses. Increase public awareness of fecal coliform bacteria pollution through coordinated education and outreach efforts.

### **Ongoing Efforts**

EPD administers and enforces a variety of permit programs designed to facilitate the management of urban runoff, including both point and nonpoint source controls. EPD's Nonpoint Source Program regulates municipal and industrial storm water discharges through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process. Sanitary sewer overflows are managed through EPD's Permitting Compliance and Enforcement Program. Animal wastes in Georgia are addressed through the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with NRCS and SWCC and through recently adopted rules designed to regulate Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) for swine. This includes a requirement for certain operations to obtain individual NPDES permits. TMDLs were completed for each stream segment in 2001. TMDL implementation plans will be completed in 2002.

In addition to regulatory activities, EPD assists in the development of local solutions to water quality problems by administering grant programs and providing technical assistance to various regional and local watershed management initiatives. EPD also conducts a variety of outreach and public education programs addressing urban runoff in general, point and Nonpoint source pollution, BMP implementation, regulatory requirements, and cooperative or non-regulatory approaches.

The Georgia Department of Human Resources (DHR) Division of Public Health - Environmental Services has promulgated new rules (O.C.G.A Chapter 290.5.26) developed to regulate the design, operation, and maintenance of on-site sewage management systems. DHR subsequently formed the Onsite Sewage Management Systems Technical Review Committee in 1999. The Committee's function will be to make recommendations to the department regarding the approval of new systems, assist the Department with the development and revision of standards and guidelines for new technology, assist with the adoption of periodic updates to the Manual for On-Site Sewage Management Systems, and serve as the final authority in contested interpretation issues regarding the Rules and the Manual for On-site Sewage Management Systems.



Agriculture is making progress in controlling bacterial loads. Considerable effort has been directed toward animal confinement areas. Georgia universities and agricultural agencies or groups are conducting several agricultural efforts with statewide implementations. Sustainable Agriculture and Farm-A-Syst Training will be scheduled within the basin. The University of Georgia and ARS have proposals for assessing nutrient and fecal coliform bacteria reducing BMPs on 10 farms that will have statewide implications. Soil and Water Conservation Districts annually convene Local Work Groups (LWGs), which are comprised of resource professionals from a variety of disciplines and interested stakeholders at the local level, to identify resource concerns in their areas. The LWGs develop proposals for USDA or other funding to address identified resource concerns.

The University of Georgia College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences' Animal Waste Awareness in Research & Extension (AWARE) program conducts research on animal waste management and provides public education through Southeast Sustainable Animal Waste Workshops and a variety of Internet publications.

Local Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) and Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Councils are working with producers to utilize animal waste according to Nutrient Management Plans through their Lagoon Pumpout Program.

### **Identified Gaps and Needs**

Sources of fecal coliform bacteria in many stream segments are not clearly defined. In some cases, fecal bacterial loads may be attributable to natural sources (e.g. wildlife); alternative bacteriological sampling methods may be useful to distinguish between human, other mammalian, and avian fecal coliform bacteria sources. Sanitary sewer leaks and overflows may be a source of fecal coliform bacteria as well. Previous sampling was not conducted at a sufficient frequency to determine whether the monthly geometric mean criterion specified in the standard has actually been violated. Thus, an initial effort in the next RBMP cycle may be to continue to collect an adequate number of samples (four over a 30-day period) to support geometric mean calculations to determine if water quality standards are actually being exceeded.

Many fecal coliform bacteria reducing practices are relatively expensive and the percentage of reduction is often unknown. Many landowners are reluctant to spend today's dollars for long term amortization in uncertain future markets. Agricultural BMPs and cost share dollars (Farm Bill), grants (Section 319) and should be concentrated in priority watersheds with sufficient technical workforce to implement BMPs through long term agreements or contracts to reduce sediment loading.

Additional efforts should be directed toward increasing public awareness of fecal coliform bacteria pollution, with an emphasis on potential sources and BMPs. State and basin-wide coordination between agencies and organizations providing public education and technical assistance may help to extend outreach efforts.

### **Strategies for Action**

Separate strategies are needed to address Nonpoint fecal coliform bacteria loadings for urban and rural sources.

#### **A. General Strategies for Urban Sources**

Addressing urban runoff will be a complex task, and will require implementation of watershed pollution control programs by local governments. Management of urban runoff is needed to address a variety of water quality problems, including metals, fecal coliform bacteria, nutrients, and habitat degradation. For this five-year phase of the basin management cycle, management will concentrate on source control and planning. Evaluation of the efficacy of this approach will be made during the basin strategy

reevaluation scheduled for 2006 in accordance with the statewide RBMP management cycle. In addition, EPD and EPA have developed TMDLs for 303(d) listed streams in the Satilla River Basin. EPD will, along with partner agencies such as local governments, NRCS, GSWCC, GFC, be implementing the TMDLs.

### **Specific Management Objectives**

Stakeholders should work together to encourage and facilitate local watershed planning and management to ensure that designated water uses are supported.

Agricultural agencies will provide technical and educational assistance to producers for the purpose of facilitating agricultural BMP implementation.

### **Management Option Evaluation**

Integrated management options will be proposed, implemented, and evaluated by local governments.

### **Action Plan**

TMDLs were completed for each stream segment in 2001. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.

EPD will continue to ensure that all permitted sources remain in compliance with permitted effluent limitations for fecal coliform bacteria. EPD will also request a comprehensive watershed assessment, focusing on both point and nonpoint sources, from localities applying for new or expanded NPDES point source discharge permits. The intent is to direct localities' attention toward current and future nonpoint source issues in their watersheds and to have them consider ways to prevent or control water quality impacts due to growth. Approved watershed management steps will be included as a condition for expansion of existing water pollution control plants or construction of new plants.

EPD will continue to administer the NPDES and Permitting and Compliance and Enforcement (PCEP) Programs and encourage local planning to address management on a basin-wide scale. EPD will implement approved TMDLs.

Local governments will continue to operate and maintain their sewer systems and wastewater treatment plants, monitor land application systems, develop and implement regulations, zoning and land use planning, and implement local watershed initiatives and monitoring programs. EPD will encourage local authorities to institute programs to identify and address illicit sewage discharges, leaks and overflows of sanitary sewers, and failing septic tanks within their jurisdiction.

DHR will continue to regulate on-site sewage management systems and will work to educate local governments and citizen groups about the need for proper design, construction, and maintenance of septic systems to protect water quality. DHR will also utilize the criteria presented in the Growth Planning Act for septic system setbacks from high value waters. Local municipalities should work with the local health departments to identify locations of septic systems and educate owners about the proper care and maintenance of septic systems.

EPD will encourage citizen involvement through Adopt-A-Stream groups to address restoration of urban streams. Citizen groups will implement Adopt-A-Stream programs, and work with local governments in implementing watershed initiatives.

### **Method for Tracking Performance**

EPD tracks point source discharges through inspections and evaluations of self-monitoring data. An evaluation of the status of listed water bodies will be made coincident with the next iteration of the RBMP cycle for the Satilla River basin in 2006.

## **B. General Strategies for Rural Sources**

Agricultural cost share dollars (Farm Bill), grants (Section 319), and loans (Clean Water Act State Revolving Fund) need to be concentrated in priority watersheds with sufficient technical workforce to implement BMPs through long term agreements or contracts.

### **Specific Management Objectives**

Stakeholders should work together to encourage and facilitate local watershed planning and management to ensure that designated water uses are supported.

Agricultural agencies will provide technical and educational assistance to producers for the purpose of facilitating agricultural BMP implementation.

### **Management Option Evaluation**

Evaluation will be on a site-by-site basis. For agricultural BMP support, existing prioritization methods will be used.

### **Action Plan**

EPD will assess use support in streams, encourage local planning efforts, and regulate point sources under the NPDES program. EPD will continue to ensure that all permitted sources remain in compliance with fecal coliform bacteria limits. EPD will also continue monitoring and assessment of Land Application Systems. EPD will implement approved TMDLs. TMDLs were completed for each stream segment in 2001. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.

GSWCC and local SWCDs and RC&D councils, with assistance from NRCS, will continue to support adoption of BMPs for animal waste handling and will follow up on complaints related to fecal coliform bacteria associated with agriculture. Methods for prioritization and implementation of cost-share incentives under the 1996 Farm Bill will be targeted to areas of apparent water quality impact, including rural streams which may contain excessive fecal coliform loads from animal and cropland operations.

Local SWCDs will convene Local Work Groups to identify local resource concerns and develop proposals for funding to address these concerns.

The DHR will continue to regulate on-site sewage management systems and will work to educate local governments and citizen groups about the need for proper design, construction, and maintenance of septic systems to protect water quality. The DHR will also utilize the criteria presented in the Growth Planning Act for septic system setbacks from high value waters. Local municipalities should work with the local health departments to identify locations of septic systems and educate owners about the proper care and maintenance of septic systems.

The University of Georgia will provide on-farm assistance to local producers through their Farm-A-Syst Program.

EPD will encourage citizen involvement through Adopt-A-Stream groups to address restoration of urban streams. Citizen groups will implement Adopt-A-Stream programs and work with local governments in implementing watershed initiatives.

### **Method for Tracking Performance**

Agricultural agencies will track rates of BMP implementation for cropland and animal operations. An evaluation of the status of listed water bodies will be made coincident with the next iteration of the RBMP cycle for the Satilla River basin in 2002-2006.

### **7.3.4 Fish Consumption Guidelines**

#### **Problem Statement**

The water use classifications were not fully supported in several water body segments due to fish consumption guidelines for mercury and in one segment due to dieldrin. There are no known point source discharges or other identifiable anthropogenic sources of mercury or dieldrin in these watersheds. Mercury may be present in fish due to mercury content in the natural soils, from municipal or industrial sources, or from fossil fuel use. It is also possible that the elevated mercury level is related to global atmospheric transport and deposition.

#### *Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070201)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in two Satilla River mainstem due to fish consumption guidelines recommended because of mercury residues. The guidelines are for largemouth bass, redbreast sunfish, and/or channel catfish.

#### *Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070203)*

The water use classification of fishing was not fully supported in five estuarine areas based on fish consumption guidelines due to PCBs, mercury and toxaphene. The guidelines are for several fish and shellfish species.

#### **General Goals**

Work to protect human health by providing guidelines for consumption of fish.

#### **Ongoing Efforts**

DNR has monitored fish and issued fish consumption guidelines. There are no known point source discharges or other identifiable anthropogenic sources of mercury in the Satilla River basin watersheds. Ongoing efforts will focus on continued monitoring of residue levels and issuance of updated consumption guidelines. TMDLs were completed for each stream segment in 2001. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.

Parts of the Satilla are coastal plain blackwater swamp systems. These systems are characterized by a high content of organic carbon (organic ligand humic substances), low alkalinity and pH, and naturally lower dissolved oxygen content. Blackwater systems have been found to have physico-chemical characteristics that provide both a sink for the accumulation of mercury from atmospheric deposition or other sources, and to provide an environment conducive to the methylation of mercury. As a result, baseline mercury residues found in fish tissues are higher than that found in other waterbodies having a different chemistry.

PCBs have been detected in fish tissue from coastal estuarine waters of Gibson, Terry, and Purvis Creeks as well as the Turtle River System near Brunswick. Toxaphene has been detected in fish tissue in Dupree and Terry Creeks. The PCBs and toxaphene are attributed to industrial operations in the Brunswick area. The USEPA has initiated Superfund cleanup operations to address the issues and anticipates that Superfund remediation actions will provide for attainment of water quality goals in the future. TMDLs were completed for each stream segment in 2001. TMDL implementation plans will be completed in 2002.

#### **Identified Gaps and Needs**

The source of mercury in the basin is not well quantified. Mercury within these watersheds is likely derived from natural sources or from atmospheric deposition.

### General Strategies for Action

Because mercury is not originating from any known point or other identifiable anthropogenic sources, the strategy is to keep the fishing public notified of risks associated with fish consumption.

EPD and WRD will work to protect public human health by issuing fish consumption guidelines as needed, indicating the recommended rates of consumption of fish from specific waters. The guidelines are based on conservative assumptions and provide the public with factual information for use in making rational decisions regarding fish consumption.

### Action Plan

- WRD and EPD will continue to sample and analyze fish tissue and issue fish consumption guidelines as needed. The next round of fish tissue sampling for this watershed will be considered in fiscal year 2003 in accordance with the river basin monitoring cycle. TMDL implementation plans will be developed in 2002.
- The USEPA will continue to implement Superfund remediation actions to address the contaminated sites.

### Method of Tracking Performance

Trends in fish tissue concentration; number of Fish Consumption Guidelines.

## 7.3.5 Erosion and Sedimentation

### Problem Statement

Water use classifications for fishing and/or recreation are potentially threatened in many water body segments by erosion and loading of sediment which can alter stream morphology, impact habitat, and reduce water clarity. Potential sources include urban runoff and development (particularly construction), unpaved rural roads, stream erosion (including head cutting, bank erosion, and shifting of the bedload), forestry practices, and agriculture. Potential threats from sediment loading are possible throughout the Satilla River Basin, although there are no stream segments listed at this time in the basin as not fully supporting designated water uses due to poor fish communities or sedimentation. A common strategy is proposed for addressing erosion and sedimentation throughout the basin. However, achieving standards in individual stream segments will depend on the development of site-specific local management plans.

#### *Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070201)*

The 1992 Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) compliance survey examined 17 sites involving 1,290 acres in this subbasin. Twelve sites each were evaluated on private lands and five on forest industry lands. Overall, 96 percent of harvested acres and 99 percent of main haul road miles were in compliance with BMPs. No site-prepared acres or regenerated acres were evaluated. By ownership, compliance for roads and harvesting on private lands was 100 percent and 96 percent, respectively. Compliance on forest industry land for roads and harvesting was 98 percent and 96 percent, respectively.

During the 1998 BMP survey, the GFC evaluated 20 sites involving 2,917.6 acres in the sub-basin. Fifteen sites involving 1,415.5 acres were on private land and 5 sites involving 1,502 acres were on forest industry land. Except for the roads and stream crossing practice categories, BMP implementation was 90 percent or better. BMP implementation for stream crossing was 76 percent and 85 percent for roads. The percentage of acres in BMP compliance for Streamside Management Zones, timber harvesting, mechanical site preparation, chemical treatments, control burning, and

artificial regeneration averaged 99.8 percent. Compliance for stream crossings was 36 percent and 94 percent for miles of road and 94 percent on stream miles assessed.

By ownership, the 1998 results show forest industry land averaged 100 percent BMP implementation over all practice categories, including stream crossings, except for artificial regeneration where planting did not follow the contour on 1 site. On forest industry land 99 percent of the acres were in compliance with BMPs and 100 percent of the roads, stream crossings, and miles of stream were in compliance with BMPs.

On private lands, BMP implementation averaged 79 percent for streamside management zones, 36 percent for stream crossings, 74 percent for roads, 93 percent for timber harvesting, 96 percent for mechanical site preparation and 100 percent for chemical treatments, control burning, and artificial regeneration. The percentage of acres in compliance was 62 percent for SMZs while the other practices were 100 percent. Compliance on stream crossings was 12 percent and road miles was 77 percent and stream miles was 82 percent.

Another statewide BMP survey is scheduled for calendar year 2001.

Forestry BMP education is being targeted toward foresters, timber buyers, and loggers in the area to increase compliance. From December 1995 through December 2000, approximately 222 personnel affiliated with timber buyers and loggers living within the Satilla River Basin have completed the three day Master Timber Harvester Workshop sponsored by the American Forest & Paper Association (AF&PA). BMP training was conducted by the GFC.

#### *Little Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070202)*

The 1992 Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) compliance survey examined 5 sites involving 413 acres in this subbasin. Two sites were evaluated on private land and three were on forest industry lands. Overall, 95 percent of harvested acres and 100 percent of main haul road miles were in compliance with BMPs. No site preparation or regenerated acres were evaluated. By ownership, compliance for roads and harvesting on private lands was 33 percent. Compliance on forest industry land for roads and harvesting was 100 percent and 100 percent respectively.

During the 1998 BMP survey, the GFC evaluated 5 sites involving 1,258.6 acres in the sub-basin. Three sites involving 320.6 acres were on private land and 2 sites involving 938 acres were on forest industry land. BMP implementation was 100 percent for all categories of practices except for stream crossing where BMP implementation was 89 percent. No sites were evaluated for chemical treatments or control burning. The percentage of acres in BMP compliance for Streamside Management Zones, timber harvesting, mechanical site preparation, and artificial regeneration averaged 100 percent. Compliance for stream crossings was 0 percent and 100 percent for miles of road and 100 percent on stream miles assessed.

By ownership, the 1998 results show forest industry land averaged 100 percent BMP implementation over streamside management zones, roads, and harvesting. Stream crossing implementation was 89 percent. No mechanical site preparation, chemical treatment, control burning, or artificial regeneration sites were evaluated. On forest industry land 100 percent of the acres, the road miles, and the miles of stream were in compliance with BMPs. Stream crossing compliance was 0 percent.

On private lands, BMP implementation was 100 percent on SMZs, timber harvesting, mechanical site preparation and artificial regeneration. The sites evaluated contained no stream crossings, roads, chemical treatments, or control burning operations. The percentage of acres in BMP compliance was 100 percent over the categories.

Another statewide BMP survey is scheduled for calendar year 2001.

Forestry BMP education is being targeted toward foresters, timber buyers, and loggers in the area to increase compliance. From December 1995 through December 2000, approximately 90 personnel affiliated with timber buyers and loggers living within the Little Satilla River Basin have completed the three day Master Timber Harvester Workshop sponsored by the AF&PA. BMP training was conducted by the GFC.

*Turtle River Subbasin (HUC 03070203)*

The 1992 Georgia Forestry Commission (GFC) compliance survey examined 6 sites involving 820 acres in this subbasin. Two sites were evaluated on private lands and four on forest industry lands. Overall, 100 percent of harvested acres and 100 percent of main haul road miles were in compliance with BMPs. One site prepared (control burning) tract was evaluated. By ownership, compliance for roads and harvesting on private lands was 100 percent and 100 percent respectively. Compliance on forest industry lands for roads and harvesting was 100 percent and 100 percent respectively. The control burned tract was on private land and was 100 percent in compliance.

During the 1998 BMP survey, the GFC evaluated 5 sites involving 205 acres in the sub-basin. Two sites involving 71 acres were on private land and 3 sites involving 134 acres were on forest industry land. BMP implementation was 100 percent for all categories of practices except for stream crossing where BMP implementation was 71 percent. No sites were evaluated for chemical treatments or control burning. The percentage of acres in BMP compliance for Streamside Management Zones, timber harvesting, mechanical site preparation, and artificial regeneration averaged 100 percent. Compliance for stream crossings was 0 percent and 100 percent for miles of road and 98 percent on stream miles assessed.

By ownership, the 1998 results show forest industry land averaged 100 percent BMP implementation over roads, harvesting, mechanical site preparation, and artificial regeneration sites. The sites did not contain streams and therefore no SMZs or stream crossings were evaluated. No chemical treatment or control burning occurred on these sites. On forest industry land 100 percent of the acres and the road miles were in compliance with BMPs.

On private lands, BMP implementation was 100 percent on SMZs, roads, timber harvesting, and mechanical site preparation sites. Stream crossing BMP implementation was 71 percent. No chemical treatments, control burning, or artificial regenerations operations occurred on these sites. The percentage of acres in BMP compliance was 100 percent over the categories. Stream crossing compliance was 0 percent, road miles was 100 percent.

Another statewide BMP survey is scheduled for calendar year 2001.

Forestry BMP education is being targeted toward foresters, timber buyers, and loggers in the area to increase compliance. From December 1995 through December 2000, approximately 48 personnel affiliated with timber buyers and loggers living within the Turtle River Basin have completed the three day Master Timber Harvester Workshop sponsored by the AF&PA. BMP training was conducted by the GFC.

### **General Goals**

Control erosion and sedimentation from land disturbing activities in order to meet narrative turbidity water quality standards and support designated uses. Increase public awareness of erosion and sedimentation through coordinated education and outreach efforts.

The GFC will encourage implementation of the newly revised 1999 forestry BMPs through workshops and demonstrations.

## Ongoing Efforts

Forestry and Agriculture both have voluntary E&SC programs built around implementation of BMPs and water complaint resolution procedures in place. GSWCC recently updated and is distributing the Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in Georgia and the Field Manual for Erosion and Sediment Control in Georgia. The GSWCC, with its agricultural partners, has produced and distributed three E&SC pamphlets; "Guidelines for Streambank Restoration", "A Guide to Controlling Erosion with Vegetation", and "Agricultural Management Practices". These, along with a number E&SC related pamphlets and other informational materials are available in agricultural offices throughout the State. Soil and Water Conservation Districts annually convene Local Work Groups (LWGs) which are comprised of resource professionals from a variety of disciplines and interested stakeholders at the local level to identify resource concerns in their areas. These LWGs develop proposals for USDA or other funding to address identified resource concerns.

Forestry has made significant E&SC progress. GFC has been and is specifically targeting those landowner groups and regions with low compliance for increased BMP education throughout local talks, workshops, etc. The Georgia Forestry Association and the American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA) sponsor Master Timber Harvesters Workshops with the goal of training every logger in the State on BMPs. In addition, the Georgia State Board of Registration for Foresters requires every licensed forester to implement BMPs as a minimum standard of practice. As they become standard within the industry, the new Forestry BMP Guidelines, printed in January, 1999, will result in additional sedimentation reductions with more riparian tree cover left over perennial and intermittent streams.

EPD serves as the "Issuing Authority" providing permitting, inspection, and compliance enforcement services in those localities across the State where local Erosion and Sedimentation Control Ordinances or Programs are not yet established. EPD is also continuing its efforts to develop a NPDES General Permit (No. GAR100000) for storm water discharges associated with construction activity. The permit will provide guidelines and regulations for effective control of silt, sediment and other pollutants which are carried by storm water runoff from construction sites. The General Permit has been issued, appealed, and overturned four times between 1992 and 1998, but was approved in 2000.

An Erosion and Sedimentation Control (E&SC) Advisory Committee developed an Erosion and Sediment Control Complaint Resolution Procedure by which concerned citizens or other parties may register E&SC complaints. The procedure is a three-step process with Local Issuing Authorities serving as the primary contact, followed by the local Soil and Water Conservation District, and finally EPD in some cases. The purpose of the procedure is to provide timely and workable solutions to E&SC control complaints through local Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

There are several erosion educational initiatives underway which have an urban focus. Each year GSWCC and EPD conduct five formal E&SC courses to provide training to the regulated community, regulators, consultants, and interested citizens. GSWCC also provides detailed E&SC training for 8 to 11 units of government each year. A task force established by the Lieutenant Governor and the Erosion and Sediment Control Technical Study Committee, known as DIRT II, is assessing the economic and environmental impacts of erosion prevention and sediment control BMPs for urban construction sites. Another urban initiative is the U.S. Forest Service's Planting Along Stream Sides (PASS) which deals with vegetative plantings to reduce erosion from stream banks.

In 1997, EPD, in cooperation with the University of Georgia, prepared and distributed the Land Development Provisions to Protect Georgia Water Quality report. The report



describes provisions which may be modified or added to local development programs to better protect water quality. Portions of the report address water quality impacts from storm water runoff and its relationship to urban development.

Local Soil and Water Conservation Districts and Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) Councils are working with crop producers to reduce erosion and sedimentation through their No-Till Drill Program in the Satilla River basin.

### **Identified Gaps and Needs**

A key for addressing erosion, sedimentation, and habitat issues on highly impacted streams is the definition of appropriate management goals. Many highly impacted streams cannot be returned to “natural” conditions. An appropriate restoration goal needs to be established in consultation between EPD partners and other stakeholders.

Many privately owned sawmills are not members of the AF&PA. These mills and their producers are not required to attend the Master Timber Harvesters Workshops at this time. The GFC, UGA, GFA, and the Southeastern Wood Producers Association are working on a solution. A need still exists for education of private landowners who are selling timber for the last time prior to land development. Many such landowners attempt to maximize return on timber, sometimes at the expense of BMPs.

Much of the sediment being produced and adversely impacting streams and lakes is associated with development and maintenance of unpaved rural roads. In many instances E&SC plans, implementation, inspection, and enforcement are not adequate on unpaved rural road projects. Without aggressive inspection and enforcement, contractors sometimes tend to allow erosion to occur and attempt mitigation after the fact. Georgia DOT and other agencies charged with E&SC need to work with county road departments in identifying road segments that are high sediment producers and recommend abatement measures. Additional monitoring may be needed to quantify the impact of unpaved rural roads as a source of sedimentation into streams.

Additional efforts should be directed toward increasing public awareness of erosion and sedimentation, with an emphasis on potential sources and controls. State and basin-wide coordination between agencies and organizations providing public education and technical assistance may help extend outreach efforts.

Adverse impacts of excess sediment loading include degradation of habitat and reduction of species diversity. These types of impacts are best evaluated through biological monitoring, for which improved capabilities are needed. EPD is developing increased capability for biomonitoring using Rapid Bioassessment Protocols (RBPs) for benthic macroinvertebrates. The EPD protocols also include habitat assessment. The WRD is working with the IBI (Index of Biologic Integrity) to assess fish communities. These tools will provide methods to detect and quantify impairment of aquatic life resulting from habitat-modifying stressors such as sediment, as well as impacts from other stressors.

### **General Strategies for Action**

Many agricultural sediment reduction practices are relatively expensive and landowners are reluctant to spend today’s dollars for long term BMP amortization in uncertain future markets. Agricultural cost share dollars (Farm Bill) and perhaps low interest loans (Clean Water State Revolving Fund) should be concentrated in priority watersheds with sufficient technical workforce to implement BMPs through long term agreements or contracts to reduce sediment loading. An understanding of the role of erosion and sedimentation in urban streams is incomplete at this time. Most of these streams are impacted by a variety of stressors. An incremental or phased approach is needed to address these issues.

## Key Participants and Roles

GFC: encourage implementation of the newly revised 1999 forestry BMPs through workshops and demonstrations.

American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA): The forest products industry has a strong record of stewardship on the land it owns and manages. Member companies have agreed to a Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI) program. The goal of the program is to improve the performance of member companies and licensees, and set new standards for the entire forest industry as well as for other forest landowners through implementation of the following twelve objectives:

1. Broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by employing an array of scientifically, environmentally, and economically sound forest practices in the growth, harvest, and use of forests.
2. Promptly reforest harvested acres to ensure long-term forest productivity and conservation of forest resources.
3. Protect the water quality in streams, lakes, and other water bodies by establishing riparian protection measures based on soil type, terrain, vegetation, and other applicable factors, and by using EPA approved Best Management Practices in all forest management operations.
4. Enhance the quality of wildlife habitat by developing and implementing measures that promote habitat diversity and the conservation of plant and animal populations found in forest communities.
5. Minimize the visual impact by designing harvests to blend into the terrain by restricting clear-cut size (120 acres average) and/or by using harvest methods, age classes, and judicious placement of harvest units to promote diversity in forest cover.
6. Manage company lands of ecologic, geologic, or historic significance in a manner that accounts for their special qualities.
7. Contribute to bio-diversity by enhancing landscape diversity and providing an array of habitats.
8. Continue to improve forest utilization to help ensure the most efficient use of forest resources.
9. Continue the prudent use of forest chemicals to improve forest health and growth while protecting employees, neighbors, the public, and sensitive lands.
10. Broaden the practice of sustainable forestry by further involving non-industrial landowners, loggers, consulting foresters, and company employees who are active in wood procurement and landowner assistance programs.
11. Publicly report Program Participants' progress in fulfilling their commitment to sustainable forestry.
12. Provide opportunities for the public and the forestry community to participate in the commitment to sustainable forestry.

From a water quality perspective, Objectives 3 and 10 are extremely important. Performance measures for Objective 3 state:

- Participants will meet or exceed all established BMPs, all applicable state water quality laws and regulations, and the requirements of the Clean Water Act for forestland.

- Participants will establish and implement riparian protection measures for all perennial streams and lakes and involve a panel of experts at the state level to help identify goals and objectives for riparian protection.
- Participants will individually, through cooperative efforts or through AF&PA, provide funding for water quality research.

Performance measures for Objective 10 state:

- Participants will encourage landowners that sell timber to reforest, following harvest, and to use BMPs by providing these landowners with information on the environmental and economic advantages of these practices.
- Participants will work closely with the Southeastern Wood Producers Association, the Georgia Forestry Association, the University of Georgia School of Forest Resources, the GFC, the Georgia Wildlife Resources Division, and others in the forestry community to further improve the professionalism of loggers through the Master Timber Harvesters program by establishing and/or cooperating with existing state groups to promote the training and education of loggers in:
  1. BMPs, including road construction and retirement, site preparation, streamside management, etc.
  2. Awareness of responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act and other wildlife consideration.
  3. Regeneration and forest resource conservation.
  4. Logging safety.
  5. OSHA and wage and hour rules.
  6. Transportation.
  7. Business management including employee training, public relations, etc.

### **Specific Management Objectives**

Control erosion and sedimentation from land disturbing activities in order to meet narrative water quality standards.

### **Management Option Evaluation**

During this iteration of the basin cycle, management will focus on source control BMPs.

### **Action Plan**

Following the 1998 BMP survey, the GFC met with the Georgia Forestry Association (GFA) Environmental subcommittee and Executive Board, members from the Society of American Foresters (SAF), the Association of Consulting Foresters (ACF), and the Georgia State Board of Registration for Foresters to develop an action plan to improve BMP implementation, especially for stream crossings.

GFC will target landowner and user groups with low implementation rates for BMP education to encourage compliance with forestry BMP guidelines. GFC will work with AF&PA and forestry community to provide BMP training. The GFC also met with the Executive Board of the Association of Conservation Districts to request speaking at any local meetings to educate landowners about BMPs and their responsibilities and liabilities.

GFC will continue to monitor BMP implementation rates through biennial surveys and determine effectiveness of BMPs through habitat assessments and rapid bio-assessments of the aquatic organisms above and below forestry operations.

Member companies of the American Forest and Paper Association (AF&PA) will document performance measures for each objective through annual reports to AF&PA as required for Objective 11. AF&PA will issue an annual report to the public.

### **Method for Tracking Performance**

GSWCC, GFC, EPD, and issuing authorities will track BMP implementation: GSWCC by the number of E&SC plans reviewed and DAT evaluations and recommendations; GFC through its biennial surveys, and EPD through routine inspections of permitted projects, surveillance for any incidences of noncompliance, and enforcement activities. NRCS will track BMP implementation through its NIMS reporting system.

## **7.3.6 Groundwater Quality and Quantity**

### *Satilla River Subbasins*

#### **Issue A. Drought Conditions**

##### **Problem Statement**

Drought conditions in Georgia during the May 1998- August 2000 period significantly impacted river basins throughout the state including the St Marys, Satilla, Suwannee and Ochlockonee basins. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the state climate office, rainfall shortages in the state during the May 1998-August 2000 period range from just over 20 inches in North Central Georgia to just over 30 inches in West Central Georgia. Recorded rainfall shortages in the Suwannee and Ochlockonee regions were just over 22 inches and almost 25 inches in the St Marys and Satilla regions.

In 2000, EPD developed a Georgia Drought Report that documents and evaluates the management actions implemented by state and local authorities during the drought of 1998-2000; provides a summary of drought impacts and an objective assessment of the state's vulnerability and mitigation efforts; and presents a clear set of recommendations for improving drought preparedness and response.

Among the recommendations included are for the state to develop an effective method to evaluate consumptive use of water for agricultural irrigation, and implement programs for reducing water use while protecting the prosperity of farmers and agricultural communities.

##### **General Goals**

Georgia's goals are to control its level of drought preparedness, reduce its drought vulnerability and effectively manage its resources to meet the complex water demands of its natural environment, citizens and economic prosperity.

##### **Ongoing Efforts**

Comprehensive drought planning measures will be ongoing with the assistance of experts and stakeholders from within Georgia and the state has contracted with a team of experts from across the nation to guide and facilitate the process. The result of this effort will be a drought plan that provides a statewide framework, regional approach, and linkages with local drought plans.

### **Strategies for Action**

The 1998-2000 Georgia Drought Report provides recommendations that are designed to supplement actions taken by all Georgians to better manage their water resources, and can be facilitated by a number of state agencies, including EPD. Among the recommendations, are the following:

1. **Emergency Relief:** The State of Georgia should provide emergency grants and loans to assist local governments with critical or threatened water supplies.
2. **Water Conservation:** The State of Georgia must develop a comprehensive water conservation plan to address a wide range of water conserving measures that can be implemented to reduce water demand in Georgia.
3. **Agricultural Water Use:** The State of Georgia must develop an effective method to evaluate consumptive use of water for agricultural irrigation, and implement programs for reducing water use while protecting the prosperity of farmers and agricultural communities.
4. **State Water Plan:** The State of Georgia must perform a detailed review of existing water policy and laws and develop a comprehensive state water plan that will provide the framework and support for effective management of Georgia's water resources.
5. **State Drought Plan:** The State of Georgia must continue developing a comprehensive drought plan and drought management process in order to implement appropriate drought response, preparedness and mitigation measures in future droughts.

### **Issue B. Flooding**

#### **Problem Statement**

In March 1998, Georgia experienced widespread flooding due to heavy rainfall. The severity of the rain and the damages that resulted from flooding caused more than 65 percent of Georgia's counties to be declared federal disaster areas under Presidential Disaster Declaration 1209. May of the counties within the St Marys, Satilla, Suwannee, and Ochlockonee river basins were included in the disaster declaration. Before 1998, the last major flooding event occurred in July 1994, when tropical storm Alberto moved into southwest Georgia and caused the worst flooding in the state's history. In some parts of Georgia, the rainfall total was up to 27 inches.

#### **General Goals**

Continue to promote awareness and understanding of the need for floodplain and participation in the National Flood Insurance Program.

#### **Ongoing Efforts**

Although not as severe as the flood of 1994, the 1998 flooding affected a larger geographical area – more than 100 counties – mostly the central and southern parts of the state were impacted. In addition, to residential and commercial structures there was also damage to infrastructures. The majority of the counties within the Ochlockonee, St. Marys, Satilla and Suwannee river basins were included in the Presidential disaster declaration.

## **Strategies**

Communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) are to continue enforcing local floodplain management requirements for new and substantially damaged or improved buildings located in Special Flood Hazard Areas.

Acquisition of structures in the floodway of communities affected by the flooding disaster.

Target affected structures in the floodplain for voluntary buyouts, elevation – in-place or relocation.

Update and revise community mitigation plan and strategies based on flooding event.

Initiate or enhance public awareness and education regarding the hazards of flooding and the availability of flood insurance.

Target non-NFIP communities for future participation.

## **Key Participants**

Federal: Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) – ensures coordination among Federal departments and agencies in delivery of disaster related assistance.

State: Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA) – coordinate the state’s response and recovery efforts.

State: Floodplain Management Office – provides technical assistance and guidance to local communities.

Local: Local Governments – provide for the protection of life and property, and reduce future flood related issues.

*Satilla River Subbasin (HUC 03070203)*

## **Issue A. Flooding**

### **Problem Statement**

In March 1998, Georgia experienced widespread flooding due to heavy rainfall. The severity of the rain and the damages that resulted from flooding caused more than 65 percent of Georgia’s counties to be declared federal disaster areas under Presidential Disaster Declaration 1209. May of the counties within the St Marys, Satilla, Suwannee, and Ochlockonee river basins were included in the disaster declaration. Before 1998, the last major flooding event occurred in July 1994, when tropical storm Alberto moved into southwest Georgia and caused the worst flooding in the state’s history. In some parts of Georgia, the rainfall total was up to 27 inches.

### **General Goals**

Continue to promote awareness and understanding of the need for floodplain and participation in the National Flood Insurance Program.

### **Ongoing Efforts**

Although not as severe as the flood of 1994, the 1998 flooding affected a larger geographical area – more than 100 counties – mostly the central and southern parts of the state were impacted. In addition, to residential and commercial structures there was also damage to infrastructures. The majority of the counties within the Ochlockonee, St. Marys, Satilla and Suwannee river basins were included in the Presidential disaster declaration.

## Strategies

Communities participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) are to continue enforcing local floodplain management requirements for new and substantially damaged or improved buildings located in Special Flood Hazard Areas.

Acquisition of structures in the floodway of communities affected by the flooding disaster.

Target affected structures in the floodplain for voluntary buyouts, elevation – in-place or relocation.

Update and revise community mitigation plan and strategies based on flooding event.

Initiate or enhance public awareness and education regarding the hazards of flooding and the availability of flood insurance.

Target non-NFIP communities for future participation.

## Key Participants

Federal: *Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)* ensures coordination among Federal departments and agencies in delivery of disaster related assistance.

State: *Georgia Emergency Management Agency (GEMA)* coordinate the state's response and recovery efforts.

State: *Floodplain Management Office* provides technical assistance and guidance to local communities.

Local: *Local governments* provide for the protection of life and property, and reduce future flood related issues.

## References

The President's Long Term Recovery Action Plan for the March 1998 Georgia Flood  
Spring Disasters 1998: Helping Communities Respond and Rebuild – Georgia  
Emergency Agency (GEMA)